

4 = Outstanding
 3 = Very Good
 2 = Acceptable
 1 = Limitations
 0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM Murrieta Public Library 2067

Overall Rating

4

Ratings Summary

<i>BOND ACT CRITERIA</i>	<i>RATING</i>	
Urban and Rural		See Map
Population Growth		3980%
Age and Condition	4	
Needs of residents/response of proposed project to needs	3	
Plan of service integrates appropriate technology	4	
Appropriateness of site	4	
Financial capacity (new libraries only)		yes

Non-Evaluative Comments

Murrieta currently receives library services through a 4,000 square foot leased facility. According to the Bond Act Regulations (Title 5, Division 2, Chapter 3, Article 1), a leased facility is considered to be an existing library if the lease has a total duration of not less than 20 years.

Project Summary

<i>Applicant:</i>	Murrieta, City of
<i>Library Jurisdiction:</i>	Murrieta Public Library
<i>Project Type/Priority:</i>	New Library/1
<i>Project Square Footage:</i>	24,951
<i>State Grant Request:</i>	\$6,373,676

EVALUATION FORM

Murrieta Public Library 2067

Age and Condition of Existing Library

Regulatory Basis: 20440, Appendices 1 & 3

Age Rating

- 4 = No Existing Facility
- 4 = 1949 or older
- 3 = 1950-1959
- 2 = 1960-1964
- 1 = 1965-1974
- 0 = 1975-2003

RATING

4

4

N/A

Structural Renovation Rating

- 4 = No Renovation
- 4 = 1954 & earlier
- 3 = 1955-1962
- 2 = 1963-1972
- 1 = 1973-1978
- 0 = 1979-2003

- 4 = Extremely Poor Condition
- 3 = Poor condition
- 2 = Acceptable condition
- 1 = Good condition
- 0 = Very good condition

Condition of Existing Library

1. Structural
2. Lighting
3. Energy
4. Health & Safety
5. ADA
6. Acoustical
7. Flexibility
8. Spatial Relationships
9. Site Considerations

	R1	R2	R3
N/A			
N/A			
N/A			
N/A			
N/A			
N/A			
N/A			
N/A			
N/A			

Rating panel comments

Library construction date: No existing library.

Library renovation date:

4 = Outstanding
 3 = Very Good
 2 = Acceptable
 1 = Limitations
 0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

Murrieta Public Library 2067

Needs and Response to Needs

Regulatory Basis: 20440 pp. 26, 27, 60-69

RATING

3

Community Library Needs Assessment

1. Methodology & community involvement.
2. Community analysis/community agencies & organizations, service area demographics
3. Analysis of service needs/consistency with demographics
4. Service limitations for existing facility (if applicable)
5. Space needs assessment
6. Executive summary includes description of K-12 student population and their needs

N/A

R1	R2	R3
3	3	4
4	3	4
4	3	4
3	2	3
4	3	4

Library Plan of Service

7. How well project responds to needs of residents
8. How well project responds to needs of K-12 students as expressed in Needs Assessment
9. How well mission, roles, goals, objectives, service indicators are documented
10. How well types of services are documented
11. How well types of K-12 services are documented
12. How project fits into jurisdiction-wide Plan of Service

R1	R2	R3
4	4	4
4	4	4
2	2	2
4	3	4
4	3	4
3	3	3

Library Building Program

13. How well Building Program implements Plan of Service.
14. How well Building Program documents general requirements for Library Building.
15. How well spatial relationships are described.
16. How well individual spaces are sized and described.

R1	R2	R3
3	3	3
3	4	3
4	3	3
3	3	2

Conceptual Plans

17. How well net-assignable SF on plan matches Building Program
18. How well non-assignable SF on plan matches Building Program
19. How well spatial relationships on plan match Building Program

R1	R2	R3
4	4	4
4	4	3
4	3	3

Joint Use Cooperative Agreement

20. How well roles & responsibilities are defined.
21. How clearly joint library services are described.
22. Appropriateness, adequacy, reasonableness of hours of service.
23. Appropriateness, adequacy, reasonableness of staffing/volunteers.
24. How well ownership issues are resolved
25. Appropriateness, adequacy, reasonableness of sources & uses of funding
26. Appropriateness, adequacy, reasonableness of review & modification process
27. How well agreement demonstrates a workable, mutually beneficial long-term partnership.

R1	R2	R3
3	3	3
4	3	4
3	2	2
2	1	2
2	2	3
2	1	2
2	2	2
3	2	3

4 = Outstanding
3 = Very Good
2 = Acceptable
1 = Limitations
0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

Murrieta Public Library 2067

Rating Panel Comments

R1:

Needs Assessment:

The needs assessment process included a variety of methods of obtaining input from the community, which resulted in broad representation of the user groups. The results of a professionally done, city-wide user satisfaction survey were included as a part of the information-gathering. Analysis of the information resulted in logical conclusions regarding library service needs.

A very good space needs assessment, particularly in the collections area. For the most part, the allocations and conversion factors were very well documented. However, Libris Design does not determine the number of readers seats in the library, the user of the database does. The question of how it was determined how many readers seats are needed in the library to meet the needs of the residents was never addressed. The same is true for technology units.

Plan of Service:

The planned services show a clear link to the results of the needs assessment. Goals and objectives are organized differently from what is typically seen, but support the defined needs and include a clear implementation plan. While the document may need to be fine-tuned before staff can plan the services as intended, the overall result of the plan of service is positive.

Joint Use Agreement:

The agreement is an outgrowth of an existing collaborative relationship, and there are clear reasons for targeting schools. The agreement is not clear concerning the availability of staffing for the joint venture services, but there is a volunteer training coordinator specified. There is a commitment to provide funding, but no funding levels are specified. The review and modification process is a proactive one and will take place annually.

Building Program:

A very good general requirements section that could have had more detail, but is a very credible effort.

Exceptionally well-stated spatial relationships in narrative and graphic form, however there are a few minor inconsistencies.

The individual space descriptions are very well documented and appear to be appropriately sized, but the question arises of why the library director is slated to supervise the Young Adult area. Overall, an exceptionally well-written building program considering it was written by library staff without a building program consultant.

Conceptual Plans:

Optimal match between both net-assignable and non-assignable space in the building program and the conceptual plans.

The conceptual plans appear to meet most all of the critical spatial relationships called for in the building program.

The Computer/Telecommunications Room, Shipping and Receiving and the Library Director's Office are not particularly close to the Staff Workroom (but not bad).

The Administrative Offices are not adjacent to the public entrance.

The AV, Chair & Table Storage is not adjacent to the Conference Room

4 = Outstanding
3 = Very Good
2 = Acceptable
1 = Limitations
0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

Murrieta Public Library 2067

R2:

Needs Assessment:

A variety of methods was used. No copies of any instruments nor the detailed analysis of the results of any was provided, however. Consequently, the reader has little knowledge of what was asked or the actual results. The Godbe survey appears to have been a general city-wide services satisfaction survey, not a needs assessment for the library. The community analysis discussion of government agencies, schools, and community organizations was pretty limited. It contained a great deal of the results of the Needs Assessment, which one would expect to be in the previous section or in the analysis of service needs section. It was, however, quite a good analysis and its placement in the document is not as important as its quality. Only problems with it were the rather large amount of repetition of the same data in various places; the extensive detail of the Needs Assessment findings provided here would have been better in an appendix with summary, or most important points, here; and a numerical/statistical analysis of the Needs Assessment results should have been provided, preferably also in an appendix. The service needs analysis was a very general discussion, but since most was already said in the previous section, that is to be expected and the topic itself was very well covered by the Needs Assessment document as a whole, even if not particularly in this section. They did a good job in the space needs assessment in general, although a lot of the text could have been replaced by a few well-designed tables. They did not generally indicate what standards were the basis for their allocations, although it was probably basically Libris Design factors for those components where they did not state the standard base but just the calculation factor used. They did not indicate a particular percent of the collection for Spanish language materials, while Hispanics make up almost 20% of the service population.

Plan of Service:

The project does an excellent job of responding to the needs as defined in the Needs Assessment. The goals, objectives, etc. was a very confused and repetitive presentation that would be difficult to use as a real working document for staff and the community. They do, however, support the defined needs. The service indicators are not tied to goals and objectives. The types of services documentation was another confused, repetitive presentation but one which does address the stated needs. They provided an excellent implementation plan, one that moves the service element descriptions criteria to "very good." This project fits into the city's planning very well, although there is no library master plan per se, and the plan of service provided here for this single library jurisdiction is very unclear.

Joint Use Agreement:

This is not a mutually beneficial agreement. The district commits to provide copies of text books for students to use in the library and to have a teacher accompany his class when it comes to the library to use the computer center. The library pays for everything else. The hours are adequate for a computer center primarily intended for use by school classes; they are inappropriate for after school homework use which is cited as another potential use for center but is not indicated as a Joint use effort. A question also arises about how effective the center can be when there are only 20 computers in it and a requirement that no more than 24 students can use it at one time in a class environment (Field Act). There are few school classes that have only that few students in them; what is the teacher who brings her class to the library for some class training event in the computer center to do with the rest of her students when there are more than 20 in the class?

Building Program:

The Building Program is outstanding in describing the general requirements. The spatial relationships between the individual spaces, and descriptions of the individual spaces are very well done. The bubble diagram is highly effective in communicating to the architect the spatial relationships and adjacencies. However, there are some discrepancies, such as, the bubble diagram does not show the relationship between Fiction Collections and Periodical Collections, and the Reference Services. More detail would have made the individual space descriptions clearer and a better communication tool for the architect.

Conceptual Plan:

The net and non-assignable square footage is extremely well done. They are exceptional in matching the Building Program within reason. The spatial relationships match the Building Program very well, and the presentation with color made it easy to read. However, there are several places where there are discrepancies between the Building Program and what's on the plan, such as, the YA should be away from Non-fiction; the Copy Center should be close to Reference; the Reference Desk and Study/Tutoring Rooms should be close to YA. It appears that the Non-fiction seating is separate from the Non-fiction Collection. This may be tolerable in a remodel, but in the design of a new building, it is not appropriate.

4 = Outstanding
3 = Very Good
2 = Acceptable
1 = Limitations
0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

Murrieta Public Library 2067

R3:

Needs Assessment: Applicant utilized a variety of methods to obtain community input--received input from teachers, high school students and from the general community. Telephone survey was conducted by Godbe and was more of a customer satisfaction tool. Also used informal community gatherings and interviews with key informants from the community. Did an excellent job at providing demographic data and input from local community groups, along with library service needs. Have done an excellent job of including needs for students in elementary, middle, and high schools.

Plan of Service: An excellent job of responding to community needs identified in the needs assessment. Have melded findings into eight service goals. Objectives are somewhat confusing and seem to be more like activities rather than measurable objectives. Have included goals and objectives for both Children's Services and Teen Services. Have included a clearly written implementation plan.

Building Program: Bubble diagram shows that the Teen Area is located near the library administrative offices and away from the computer resource center and from the tutoring rooms which are located near the reference area. This arrangement may limit the usage of the area since most teens want more access to computers and to study rooms where they can work on group homework projects.

Joint Use Agreement: The applicant has described an electronic means of having homework assignments linked to computers at the public libraries via "Assignment Links." This would help students and parents who would have access to exactly what the assignment is. It also has the potential of assisting the public library staff who are often unaware of the assignments until the students descend looking for materials for homework assistance. Since most districts and teachers have their own web sites, it makes it relatively easy to make that information available at the public library. School libraries seem to be growing in this fast-growth area so, at least at the beginning of this partnering effort, it may seem that the public library is doing most of the work. That has been acknowledged by the school districts who have indicated that the balance of responsibilities will change as more school libraries are established. The initial illusion of the partnering effort may seem to be one sided, however, that is not the way that it will always be. Roles and responsibilities are clearly delineated.

This agreement has the potential of initiating an innovative approach to homework assignments that should be shared on a statewide basis. This partnering effort has the potential of becoming permanent.

Building Program:

Page numbers refer to the Building Program.

General requirements: Is a one-story building an appropriate design to be locked into, for facility serving a city of 95,000 in 2020 buildout. (P. 51, available expansion with enable 40,000 sq. ft., which is .42 square ft. / capita, a modest amount. P. 2 last para. Indicates the design is already done, and not a result of requirements here stated. p. 17 speaks of a children's desk, in addition to a reference desk and circ desk; p. 10 says that for staff efficiency there will be only two desks - circ and a combined ref. desk. Otherwise, a very comprehensive set of general requirements (although might have specified illumination levels; perhaps room sheets will).

Spatial relations: Bubble diagram clear, and has problems. (Does suggest three service desks, contra p. 10. (p. 54 has children's' desk). YA, Period. and fiction accessible only through Library Director, not directly from Circ. area etc. Maybe text will correct.

Text pages:

text pages: p. 47, Admin. near staff work areas (contra bubble diagram); Passport not near (contra bubble diagram).

p. 51: p. 69 - if processing passport applications, need PC/printer/etc.? copy machine? p. 87: 42" shelving for new books - looks nice, but doesn't hold much. 58"? 66"? p. 121 - a workstation is specified, but there is no activity noted on p. 120 that requires that. p. 125: Restroom doors should not open directly into workspaces. p. 131: since mending is done here, have a handsink? p. 133: walls and windows for sound isolation and viewing? p. 149: "At south side of library" - says that building has already been massed, before program requirements are written. p. 153: nothing re adjacency to Staff / Service entrance, p. 121. p. 158: no workstation to check things in local and distant catalogs? shelving for non-rare materials for reference etc.? Nothing re where to return books. There is 1 depressible bin mentioned in the Circ. Desk FFE). No return slots mentioned in public entry, lobby, circ. desk, staff workroom. Circ. desk functions do not mention receiving returned books. p. 128 staff workroom mentions processing books from exterior book returns, or books returned at circulation desk. (If exterior book return, must go into fire rated and sprinklered closet)

Conceptual plans: assignable square footage very close to Program. gross square footage identical to program, reinforcing that drawing came before program requirement determined. Spatial relationships: Two problems: Children's desk view of children's area obscured by book stacks. Heritage Room far away from the Reference desk (contra p. 156). Otherwise conforms to program.

4 = Outstanding
3 = Very Good
2 = Acceptable
1 = Limitations
0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

Murrieta Public Library 2067

Integration of Electronic Technologies

RATING

4

Regulatory Basis: p.68, 20440, Appendix 4

Integration of Electronic Technologies

1. Appropriateness of electronic technologies in Plan of Service, based on Needs Assessment
2. How well the integration of electronic technologies is documented in Plan of Service
3. How well the integration of electronic technologies is documented in the Building Program

R1	R2	R3
4	3	4
4	3	4
4	3	4

Rating Panel Comments

R1:

There are clear links between the needs assessment and plan of service concerning the need for technology in providing library services. A technology plan with its own goals and objectives was included with the application documents, and it is clear, understandable, and should be easy to implement.

R2:

They did a very good job of describing plans for technology-related services and programs and included some information on the infrastructure intended to support these at startup of the new library. Missing was evidence of planning for some of the current leading edge technologies (e.g. ports/electrical for users' portable, wireless communications, self check-in/check-out, etc.) or to build in infrastructure flexibility to best prepare for future technological enhancements. There was passing mention of some of these elements in the Building Program but none in the technology plan which should be guiding the Building Program.

R3:

This technology plan includes five goals with extensive descriptions of equipment and databases. Does a very good job at describing how technology meets the needs of K-12 students.

4 = Outstanding
 3 = Very Good
 2 = Acceptable
 1 = Limitations
 0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

Murrieta Public Library 2067

Site

Regulatory Basis: p.39, 20440, Appendix 1

RATING

4

Appropriateness of Site

1. Equal access for all residents in service area.
2. Accessibility via public transit.
3. Accessibility via pedestrian and bicycle.
4. Accessibility via automobile.
5. Adequacy of automobile parking.
6. Adequacy of bicycle parking.
7. Overall parking rationale.
8. Shared parking agreement (if applicable).
9. Visibility of site & proposed library building in service area
10. How well site fits community context & planning
11. Site selection process and summary.

R1	R2	R3
3	4	4
2	3	2
3	3	3
4	4	4
4	4	3
3	3	3
3	4	3
N/A		
3	4	4
4	4	4
3	4	4

Site Description

12. Adequacy of size of site.
13. Appropriateness of site configuration
14. Appropriateness of site/surrounding area.
15. Appropriateness of site based on placement of building, parking, access roads, pathways, expansion and parking.

R1	R2	R3
4	4	4
4	4	4
3	4	4
3	3	4

4 = Outstanding
3 = Very Good
2 = Acceptable
1 = Limitations
0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

Murrieta Public Library 2067

Rating Panel Comments

Drainage issues: OK

Geotechnical issues: Although there is an identified fault on the site (Elsinore), all required set-backs per Uniform Codes (100 feet) have been maintained for this proposed site. Mitigating soil compaction has already taken place on the site. The site and its condition will not impact nor increase the developemnt costs of the project.

R1:

The proposed site is somewhat centrally located in the service area being located somewhat southwest of geographic center. The service area is bisected by two major interstates, Hwy I-15 and I-215 which form man-made barriers, but do not appear to impede service too much because of the high number of interchanges and over/under passes. One such interchange is for Kalmia Street (17,400 vehicles per day) which runs adjacent to the town square project site and will provide convenient access to the library for commuters using I-15. Another major arterial thoroughfare that runs by the town square project site is Jefferson Ave. (9,400 vehicles per day).

The proposed library site is located in a new "Town Square" master plan project that is being developed as part of a revitalization plan for the City of Murietta and will include along with the library, a City Hall, Police Station, Fire Station, Amphitheater, senior center, restaurant, and commercial and office space. The site map shows that the majority of the commercial development in the City is clustered around the two interstates and is located several blocks from the library site.

There is currently 1bus stop within 1/4 mile of the site, but this will be improved once the town square masterplan is completed. There is currently a paratransit service available for seniors and the disabled.

A Class I bike pat has been designed for the southerly side of Ivy and Kalmia Streets and will be implemented in conjunction with the building of the library. There will be 20 bike parking spaces near the entry to the library but they do not appear to be sheltered. Pedestrian sidewalks will be provided on all streets serving the proposed facility, including walkways within the Town Square development. There are several schools around the site, and one elementary school is just across the street from the proposed library building.

There will be 86 on-site parking spaces for the library. The application indicates that there is sufficient parking to accommodate an expansion of the building, but it would be tight depending upon the size of the expansion. The plan does show the intent to expand the building in the future, but not the parking.

The library will be visible in the Town Square development, but it is not located directly on either of the two major thoroughfares that are adjacent to the Town Square project site.

There appears to have been significant public input through public hearings and workshops about the Town Square master plan project and the library. An urban design consultant was hired.

4 = Outstanding
3 = Very Good
2 = Acceptable
1 = Limitations
0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

Murrieta Public Library 2067

R2:

I-15 and I-215 sort of divide the City into thirds. The site, part of a Town Square master plan, is in the most developed of them, with the older street grid in the same area. It is close to interchanges. All in all, access is quite equal.

Public transit is at present limited, but is to be good at opening day, with several stops on two lines, within a block of the site. Paratransit is available.

Bicycle lanes available in the immediate area, but connection further to the city unclear. The goal is to have the entire downtown area attractive to pedestrians.

Interchanges and arterials make auto access facile. Parking greatly exceeds code, and the site makes best use of available transit and of a good number of nearby schools and other facilities within walking distance.

Code requirements for bicycle parking are to be met; the racks as drawn are ample, but unsupervised and unsheltered. The site is prominent in the town square, and its 40' high structure is quite obvious. The Town Square concept was intelligently conceived and fleshed out, as an identity anchor for the new city. A variety of community meetings, and extensive consultant and staff work, led to the decision. Although alternative sites for the library as such were not considered, its inclusion from the beginning in the master plan made that not an issue.

Site is over 5X footprint, and its clean rectangular shape makes it easy to work with. As above, the location well responds to local desires and context. Although there is adequate expansion space, the organization of spaces within the existing design does not make for as sensible a layout after expansion as might be desired.

R3:

The proposed site is reasonably central to the service area and is a prominent part of an ambitious plan to create a new downtown area, "Town Square", for this rapidly growing new city. When complete the downtown core will include the new library, police headquarters (already built), fire headquarters, a new city hall, senior center and a downtown park with an amphitheater. The "super block" that will contain the overall Town Square project is bounded by two major arterials, Kalmia on the north, and Jefferson on the east and is about 1 mile southwest of Interstate 15. Public transit is currently somewhat limited but is planned to improve considerably as the project is implemented. A Class I bike path will be built on Ivy and Kalmia Streets as part of the overall Town Square project and sidewalks and walkways will interconnect all of the area's planned facilities. Automobile access is excellent from Adams which connects to Kalmia. Parking consists of 86 spaces on site/off street. 20 bicycle spaces are provided, though none appear to be sheltered. The library will occupy a central and highly visible position in the new downtown "superblock". The site will easily accommodate significant future expansion.

EVALUATION FORM
Murrieta Public Library 2067

Financial Capacity

Regulatory Basis: Bond Act p. 5, Section 19998 (a) (7)

Rating Panel Comments:

Applicant has committed to the on-going operation of the completed library.